Title: The Effects of Social Media Influencers’ Self-Disclosure, Source Credibility, and Parasocial Relationships on Brand Trust and its Consequences

Affiliation:
Kaukab Abid Azhar, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia.
Zubair A. Shah, Hamdard University, Karachi, Pakistan.
Hassaan Ahmed, Salim Habib University, Karachi, Pakistan.
Nayab Iqbal, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia


Citation:

Copyright:
This article is open access and is distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
1. Copyright of all the submissions to the Market Forces will remain to the contributors.
2. Anyone can distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon his/her work, even commercially, as long as it is credited/cited to the original contributors of the Market Forces.

Conflict of Interest
The author (s) declared no conflict of interest and have not received any funds for the project.
The Effects of Social Media Influencers’ Self-Disclosure, Source Credibility, and Parasocial Relationships on Brand Trust and its Consequences

Kaukab Abid Azhar
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia

Zubair A. Shah
Hamdard University, Karachi, Pakistan

Hassaan Ahmed
Salim Habib University, Karachi, Pakistan

Nayab Iqbal
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia

Abstract

The availability of social media to most of the population has significantly increased in the present era. Social media users now have many options to access personal and job-related information. Many users seek opinions from social media influencers about goods and services because of their parasocial relationships. Past studies document that, besides other factors, an essential precursor of social media influencers is “intimate relationships between social media users and followers.” Thus, the study has examined the effect of “self-disclosure on parasocial relationships and source credibility.” It also examined the effect of “parasocial relationship and source credibility on brand trust.” In addition, it examined the effect of “brand trust on commitment and brand loyalty.” The study has collected a sample of 472 students from leading local universities in
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Karachi. It focused on them because the students are active users of social media. The study documents that self-disclosure positively affects parasocial relationships and source credibility. Parasocial relationships and source credibility promote brand trust. In addition, brand trust positively effects commitment and brand loyalty. These findings are crucial for understanding the dynamics of social media influencers and their impact on brand trust and loyalty. It also provides valuable insights for marketers and researchers in the domain of social media influencers.
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**Introduction**

Social media influencers develop likable personalities by sharing informative content on social media forums (Vrontis et al., 2021), revolutionizing how individuals share and interact (Masuda et al., 2022). Their popularity has led most firms worldwide to use social media as a platform to connect with their target audience (Hudders, De-Jans, & De-Veirman, 2021). Balaban and Szambolics (2022) assert that with the rise of social media influencers, they have assumed the crucial role of intermediaries between brands and consumers. Furthermore, Pei and Mayzlin (2022) argue that social media influencers command respect and credibility from their followers by sharing their personal information (Ooi et al., 2023). This underscores the significant influence that social media influencers wield in shaping consumer attitudes and behaviors, making them a key focus of our study.

Moreover, social media influencers create a conducive social environment for their followers by sharing personal information that significantly changes their attitudes and behaviors toward goods and services (Pop et al., 2022). As a result, it promotes personal and intimate relationships between social media users and followers, leading to successful endorsement strategies (Lee et al., 2022). Thus, it is important to understand how followers react to social media influencers’ self-disclosure (Masuda et al., 2022). Studies suggest self-disclosure enhances social media influencers’ credibility and promotes parasocial relationships (Gammoudi et al., 2022). Depending on the social media reputation and relationships, followers develop a positive or negative perception about social media influencers (Cheung et al., 2022). If consumers feel that the social media influencer’s content is honest, candid, and truthful, “they perceive them as credible (Borges-Tiago et al., 2023).

Consequently, it enhances trust in the brands recommended by social media influencers. A parasocial relationship develops between followers and social media
influencers when social media influencers share intimate personal information with
the followers (Koay et al., 2023). As a result, it promotes “one-to-one relationships,” an
essential precursor of “pseudo-relationships.” (Alcántara-Pilar et al., 2024). Like source
credibility, parasocial relationships also promote trust toward the brand recommended
by social media influencers (Saini et al., 2023). Furthermore, literature also documents
that brand trust promotes “commitment and brand loyalty” (Lacap et al., 2024). Given
the above discussions, we have examined the “effect of self-disclosure on parasocial
relationships and source creditably.” We also examined the “effect of parasocial
relationship and source creditably” on brand trust. Moreover, the study has examined
the effect of “brand trust on commitment and brand loyalty.”

Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

Self-Disclosure and Parasocial Relationship

Many consumers use social media to develop social relationships as an alternative
to real relationships. Mostly, such consumers are uncomfortable interacting in real
relationships (Koay et al., 2023). When social media influencers share their personal
information with their followers, which they normally would share with their close
friends, the followers perceive that social media influencers trust them and consider
them as close friends (Lu et al., 2023). Similarly, Lacap et al. (2024) argue that when social
media users receive personal information from social media influencers, they perceive
that they know them personally, resulting in intimate relationships. Furthermore, the
frequent social and personal interaction between social media users and followers
further enhances intimate relationships (Xu et al., 2024).

Researchers believe two relationships exist between “social media users and
influencers” (Zafina & Sinha, 2024). A low level of relationship develops when “social
media users and influencers” share content related to hobbies, attitudes, and behavior
toward a product or service. At the same time, a high relationship develops when they
share interpersonal information, which they only share with close friends (Lim & Lee,
2023). For example, they share issues and problems at work and home (Wang & Liao,
2023). Thus, we argue that sharing such information promotes one-to-one relationships,
an essential component of “pseudo-relationships” (Chantokul & Chantamas, 2023).

H1: The “social media influencer's self-disclosure promotes parasocial relationship.”

Self-Disclosure and Source Credibility

Marin and Gabbert (2023) assert that social media influencers often disclose personal
information to develop sustainable and intimate relationships with social media users.
As a result, it increases their credibility and familiarity. Similarly, the Self-Disclosure Theory also endorses that the norms of reciprocity enhance the relationship between social media users and followers (Leite et al., 2022). As a result, it promotes sustainable and intimate relationships (Qiu et al., 2023; Lee & Johnson, 2022). Furthermore, extant literature also highlights that followers believe endorsers who share their personal information are more credible and honest than those who do not share their personal information (Nah, 2022).

Source credibility relates to social media users’ perception of social media influencers. If social media influencers are well-reputed in their domains and share honest and credible content, social media users’ perception of their credibility increases significantly (Koay et al., 2023). Past studies cite that source credibility positively relates to the effectiveness of celebrity endorsements (Zhang & Lu, 2023). Moreover, source credibility has three components: “attractiveness, truthfulness, and the degree of confidence” (Cao et al., 2023). Attractiveness refers to the “physical attractiveness of the endorsers” (Van-der, Schyff, and Flowerday, 2023). Truthfulness refers to endorsers’ “honesty and integrity” (Yuen et al., 2023). Expertise relates to “endorsers’ knowledge and skills” in their domains (Filieri et al., 2023). Researchers believe that self-disclosure affects source credibility and its sub-sub-dimensions.

**H2: Self-disclosure “positively affects source credibility.”**

**Parasocial Relationships and Brand Trust**

Social media influencers develop and maintain a parasocial relationship with followers, which increases the trust in the brands they recommend to the followers (Lacap et al., 2024). Moreover, the parasocial relationship is an essential precursor of brand trust (Shuliakouskaya, 2023). Furthermore, the “consumer-brand relationship” promotes a perception in consumers that the brand will deliver what it promised and that there will be no or little risks associated with it (Chaihanchanchai et al., 2024). Similarly, Zha et al. (2023) assert that parasocial and brand trust relationships have stemmed from the “Uncertainty Reduction Theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) and the Meaning-Transfer Model” (McCracken, 1989), giving credence to the association between “parasocial relationship and brand trust.” At the same time, Leite and Baptista (2022) argue that a brand alone cannot command consumers’ trust. A parasocial relationship between social media influencers and followers is needed (Bashokouh et al., 2020). Moreover, extant literature highlights that a vast amount of information is available on social media, but most consumers seek advice from social media influencers they trust (Aw & Labrecque, 2023). Thus, we argue that a parasocial relationship is a significant precursor of brand trust (Burnasheva & Suh, 2022). In the same context, studies argue that a parasocial
relationship reduces the buyers’ uncertainty about the brand endorsed by social media influencers. Furthermore, extant literature also highlights that the personality traits of endorsers transfer to the brands that promote positive attitudes and behaviors towards such brands (Zhong et al., 2021).

**H3: Parasocial relationship “positively affects brand trust”**

### Source Credibility and Brand Trust

Many past studies using the Uncertainty Theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) and Meaning Model (Bergkvist & Zhou, 2016) document that source credibility and brand trust are positively associated. Similarly, Akram et al. (2023) argue that consumers develop positive trust towards a brand if a credible source recommends it. However, if consumers perceive social media influencers as not credible, it may adversely affect their attitudes and behaviors toward a brand (Roy et al., 2023). Moreover, Agusiady, Saepudin, and Aripin (2024) argue that source credibility has three components: “expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness.” All these dimensions individually and collectively affect brand trust (Ahmadi & Ataei, 2024). Furthermore, Baidoun and Salem (2024) assert that when a credible source endorses a brand, it promotes a perception that the brand will perform well, thus reducing psychological risk. Similarly, consumers develop sustainable relationships with credible sources and follow their recommendations (Hussain et al., 2024). In this context, Rathee and Milfeld (2024) assert that social media influencers develop and project creditable and appealing personas that translate into endorsed brands.

**H4: Source “Credibility positively affects brand trust.”**

### Brand Trust Commitment and Loyalty

Brand trust, commitment, and loyalty are crucial elements in brand management (Tiep et al., 2023). Different researchers have defined the concept of brand trust in various ways (Akoglu & Özbek, 2022). For instance, Puspaningrum (2020) defines it as a consumer’s perception of a brand’s reliability and ability to deliver what it promised (Tiep et al., 2023). Moreover, brand trust is consumers’ belief that the brand contains specific traits and is competent and credible (Kwon et al., 2021). As a result, it enhances consumers’ commitment and loyalty. Extant literature highlights that consumers develop brand trust and loyalty based on their past interactions and experiences with a brand (Sohaib et al., 2023). Many studies have endorsed this phenomenon (Salsabila & Hati, 2024). Similarly, many researchers believe that to increase commitment and loyalty, brands need to involve and engage consumers (Na et al. 2023). Furthermore, Kwon et al. (2021) assert that brand trust promotes brand loyalty and a sustainable relationship.
between the brand and consumers. In the same context, Puspaningrum (2024) argues that consumers perceive that a trusted brand will deliver what it promises and that there will be no or little risk involved. As a result, it will promote repeat purchases and promote brand loyalty (Anggraini & Marsasi, 2024).

\textit{H5: Brand trust positively affects commitment.}

\textit{H6. Brand trust positively affects brand loyalty.}

**Conceptual Framework**

Given the above discussions, we have developed a new model depicted in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Conceptual Framework](image)

**Methodology**

**Population and Sampling**

The study has focused on social media users in Pakistan as it is now easily accessible to most of the population. There are about 72 million social media users in Pakistan, increasing exponentially. However, we have focused on the students of the leading business universities of Karachi. We have selected this segment because students are active social media users, and most follow social media influencers. The study used Rao soft to calculate the sample size, which is 387. However, to increase generalizability, we
distributed 550 questionnaires and received 472 usable questionnaires.

**Data Collection Procedure**

The study used quota sampling to collect samples from the targeted universities. Following the research protocol, we obtained permission from the management of the selected universities and then contacted the students. We also told the respondents they only needed to complete these questionnaires if they were comfortable with them and assured them that we would not share their data with others. Table 1 shows the allocated quotas for selected universities, responses received, and response rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Quota</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IQRA University</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOBM</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>80.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SZABIST</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIET</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASBIT</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>85.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instrumentation**

The study’s questionnaire has six latent and 28 indicator variables. Table 2 shows the sources from where the study adopted the constructs used in the questionnaire and reliability values in the past studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>Delgado-Ballester et al. (2003)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.744 to 0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust</td>
<td>Delgado-Ballester et al. (2003)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.759 to 0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasocial Relationship</td>
<td>Kim et al. (2015)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.789 to 0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Sundaram and Webster (2000)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.746 to 0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Leite and Baptista (2022)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.753 to 0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Commitment</td>
<td>Feick, Coulter, and Price (2003)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.738 to 0.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistical Analysis**

We used Smart PLS version 4.1 for data analysis. As suggested by Hakiki et al. (2023), before testing the hypotheses, we examined the “reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity” and found them within the acceptable range.
Result

Respondents Profile
We did not use the demographic profile for statistical analysis. We collected it to help readers determine whether it relates to other studies in educational institutions. The demographic profile we collected, presented in Table 3, is similar to other past studies in educational institutions.

Table 3: Respondents Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16 to 25 Years</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 to 35 Years</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45 Years</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-55 Years</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Plus</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Perusing Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perusing Master Degree</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Graduation Degree</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Level</td>
<td>Up to Rs.50000</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs.51000 to Rs.75000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs.76000 to Rs.100000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs.101000 to Rs.125000</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rs.126000 plus</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Measurement Model
Figure 2 depicts the measurement model (Ghauri, Grønhaug, & Strange, 2020), and the results related to “reliability, convergent, and discriminant validity are presented in the following sections.”
Descriptive Analysis

The study conducted descriptive analyses for univariate normality (Hakiki et al., 2023). Hair et al. (2021) suggest that the Skewness and Kurtosis values must be at ± 3.5 for univariate normality. The results related to Skewness and Kurtosis are within the prescribed range, suggesting that “constructs fulfill the requirement of univariate normality” (Welch et al., 2020). Also, “Cronbach’s Alpha values are within the prescribed limits, confirming the constructs have acceptable internal consistency” (Easterby-Smith et al., 2021; Sürücü & Maslakci, 2020).

Table 4: Descriptive Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>3.770</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>6.099</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasocial Relationship</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust</td>
<td>5.210</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>5.464</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>5.360</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on seven point Likert scale.

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity “is a theoretical association between latent variables and their indicators.” Table 5 shows that all composite reliability (CR) values are greater than 0.70 and AVE values are more than 0.60, confirming that the constructs fulfill the requirement of convergent validity (Ghauri et al., 2020).
Table 5: Convergent Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>3.770</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>6.099</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasocial Relationship</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust</td>
<td>5.210</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>5.464</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>5.360</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discriminant Validity**

Researchers, including Rönkkö and Cho (2022), suggest that before testing the hypotheses, it is necessary to ensure that the constructs used in studies are conceptually and empirically different. Following the advice of the above researcher, we have ascertained the discriminant validity using Fornell and Larcker (1981) criteria. The results depicted in Table 6 show that “the square root of AVE values are greater than Pearson Correlation Values, suggesting the constructs are empirically different” (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 6: Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>BT</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>LY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasocial Relationship</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypotheses Results**

The study, based on bootstrapping, generated results related to the hypotheses. Table 7 shows the hypotheses’ results, and Figure 3 depicts the structural model.

Table 7 Estimation Results for Path Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Path</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-disclosure -&gt; Parasocial Relationship (H1)</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disclosure -&gt; Source Credibility (H2)</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasocial Relationship -&gt; Brand Trust (H3)</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility -&gt; Brand Trust (H4)</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust -&gt; Commitment (H5)</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust -&gt; Brand Loyalty (H6)</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We found that our study supports all the proposed Hypotheses. We found the highest effect is for Hypothesis 5 (β=0.678, p=.002<0.05), stating, “Brand trust positively affects commitment.” On the other hand, the lowest effect is for Hypothesis 3 (β=0.120, p=0.004<0.05), stating, “parasocial relationship positively affects brand trust.”

![Figure 1 Structural Model Path Coefficient](image)

**Discussion and Conclusion**

**Discussion**

We accepted Hypothesis 1 (β=0.390, p=0.001<0.05), which states, “Self-disclosure positively affects the parasocial relationship.” When social media influencers share their personal information with their followers, which they normally would share with their close friends, the followers perceive that social media influencers trust them and consider them as close friends (Lu et al., 2023). Similarly, Lacap et al. (2024) argue that when social media users receive personal information from social media influencers, they perceive that they know them personally, resulting in intimate relationships. Furthermore, the frequent social and personal interaction between social media users and followers further enhances intimate relationships (Xu et al., 2024). Researchers believe two relationships exist between “social media users and influencers” (Zafina & Sinha, 2024). A low level of relationship develops when social media users and influencers share content related to hobbies, attitudes, and behavior toward a product or service. At the same time, a high relationship develops when they share interpersonal information, which they only share with close friends (Lim & Lee, 2023).
We accepted Hypothesis 2 (β=0.239, p=0.001<0.05), which states, “Self-disclosure positively affects the source creditability.” Marin and Gabbert 2023) assert that social media influencers often disclose personal information to develop sustainable intimate relationships with social media users. Similarly, the Self-Disclosure Theory also endorses that the norms of reciprocity enhance the relationship between social media influencers and followers (Leite et al., 2022). As a result, it enhances the credibility of the endorsers (Qiu et al., 2023). Moreover, extant literature also documents that followers perceive endorsers who share their personal information as more credible than those who do not share their personal information (Nah, 2022; Lee & Johnson, 2022).

We accepted Hypothesis 3 (β=0.120, p=0.004<0.05), which states, “Parasocial relationship positively affects the brand trust.” A parasocial relationship is an essential precursor of brand trust (Shuliakouskaya, 2023). Moreover, the “consumer-brand relationship” promotes a perception in consumers that the brand will deliver what it promised and that there will be no or little risks associated with it (Chaihanchanchai et al., 2024). Similarly, Zha et al. (2023) assert that parasocial and brand trust relationships have stemmed from the “Uncertainty Reduction Theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975) and the Meaning-Transfer Model” (McCracken, 1989), giving credence to the association between “parasocial relationship and brand trust.” At the same time, Leite and Baptista (2022) argue that a brand alone cannot command consumers’ trust. A parasocial relationship between social media influencers and followers is needed (Bashokouh et al., 2020). Moreover, extant literature highlights that a vast amount of information is available on social media, but most consumers seek advice from social media influencers they trust (Aw & Labrecque, 2023). Thus, we argue that a parasocial relationship is a significant precursor of brand trust (Burnasheva & Suh, 2022). In the same context, studies argue that a parasocial relationship reduces the buyers’ uncertainty about the brand endorsed by social media influencers. Furthermore, extant literature also highlights that the personality traits of endorsers transfer to the brands that promote positive attitudes and behaviors towards such brands (Zhong et al., 2021).

We accepted Hypothesis 4 (β=0.360 p=0.001<0.05), which states, “Source credibility positively affects brand trust.” Akram et al. (2023) argue that consumers develop positive trust towards a brand if a credible source recommends it. However, if consumers perceive social media influencers as not credible, it may adversely affect their attitudes and behaviors toward a brand (Roy et al., 2023). Moreover, Agusiady, Saepudin, and Aripin (2024) argue that source credibility has three components: “expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness.” All these dimensions individually and collectively affect brand trust (Ahmadi & Ataei, 2024). Furthermore, Baidoun and Salem (2024) assert that when a credible source endorses a brand, it promotes a perception that the brand will perform...
well, thus reducing psychological risk. Similarly, consumers develop sustainable relationships with credible sources and follow their recommendations (Hussain et al., 2024).

We accepted Hypothesis 5 ($\beta=0.678$ $p=0.002<0.05$), which states, “Brand trust positively affects commitment.” We also accepted Hypothesis 6, which states, “Brand trust positively affects brand loyalty.” Brand trust, commitment, and loyalty are crucial elements in brand management (Tiep et al., 2023). Different researchers have defined the concept of brand trust in various ways (Akoglu & Özbek, 2022). For instance, Puspaningrum (2020) defines it as a consumer’s perception of a brand’s reliability and ability to deliver what it promised (Tiep et al., 2023). Moreover, brand trust is consumers’ belief that the brand contains specific traits and is competent and credible (Kwon et al., 2021). As a result, it enhances consumers’ commitment and loyalty. Extant literature highlights that consumers develop brand trust and loyalty based on their past interactions and experiences with a brand (Sohaib et al., 2023). Many studies have endorsed this phenomenon (Salsabila & Hati, 2024). Similarly, many researchers believe that to increase commitment and loyalty, brands need to involve and engage consumers (Na et al. 2023). Furthermore, Kwon et al. (2021) assert that brand trust promotes brand loyalty and a sustainable relationship between brand and consumers. In the same context, Puspaningrum (2024) argues that consumers perceive that a trusted brand will deliver what it promises and that there will be no or little risk involved. As a result, it will promote repeat purchases and promote brand loyalty (Anggraini & Marsasi, 2024)

**Conclusion**

Social media usage and influencers have become important tools in the prevailing technological era. Brands recommended by social media influencers play an important role in changing consumers’ attitudes and behaviors. Past studies document that the effectiveness of social media influencers significantly depends on “many factors, including the intimate relationships between social media users and followers.” Given its importance, the study has examined the effect of self-disclosure on “parasocial relationships and source creditably.” It also examined the effect of “parasocial relationship and source creditably” on brand trust.” Moreover, it also examined the “effect of brand trust on commitment and brand loyalty.” The study has collected a sample of 472 students from leading local universities in Karachi. We focused on them because the students are active users of social media. The study documents that self-disclosure positively affects parasocial relationships and source credibility. Parasocial “relationship and source credibility affect brand trust.” At the same time, we found that brand “trust is a significant precursor of commitment and brand loyalty.”
Implications

Given the importance of social media influencers, we suggest that firms use them to market their brands and enhance brand trust. Consumers’ brand trust also promotes commitment and brand loyalty. Therefore, we suggest that the firms focus on enhancing brand trust. Social media influencers who share personal information develop intimate relationships with followers. Thus, we recommend that firms ensure their social media influencers are comfortable sharing personal information with their followers. Such attitudes and behaviors of the endorsers are more effective than those who are uncomfortable sharing their information with their followers. Social media personality transfers into the brand. Therefore, while recruiting social media influencers, firms must ensure that their personality traits align with their intended brand positioning.

Limitation and Future Research.

The study focused on university students in Karachi. Other studies may target other segments and cities. We have examined the effect of parasocial relationships, self-disclosure, and source credibility on brand trust. Other studies may examine these antecedents’ effects on purchase and behavioral intentions. Our model measured the relationship between brand trust, commitment, and loyalty. Other studies may explore the mediating role of brand trust between (i) Parasocial relationships and brand loyalty and (ii) Source credibility and commitment. We also recommend that others examine the indirect effect of self-disclosure on brand trust.
Annexure 1

Constructs and Items Used in the Questionnaire

**Brand Loyalty**

BL1. I consider myself loyal to the brand I use.
BL2. Under extreme circumstances, I would consider purchasing another brand.
BL3. If the store does not carry my brand, I would go to another store to buy it.
BL4. The brand I use gives the best value than other brands.
BL5. I recommend that others buy the brand I use.

**Brand Trust**

BT1. The brand I use meets my expectations.
BT2. I have confidence in the brand I use.
BT3. The brand I use never disappoints me.
BT4. The brand I use guarantees satisfaction.

**Parasocial Relationship**

PSR1. I feel close enough to use my favorite digital celebrity Apps.
PSR2. I feel comfortable with a digital celebrity’s message.
PSR3. I can rely on the information I get from my favorite digital celebrity.
PSR4. I am fascinated by my favorite digital celebrity Apps.
PSR5. In the past, I pitied my favorite digital celebrity when they made a mistake on their Apps.

**Self-Disclosure**

SD1. The celebrities I follow share information about themselves.
SD2. The celebrities I follow share their feelings.
SD3. The celebrities I follow share their emotions.
SD4. The celebrities I follow share their desires.
SD5. The celebrities I follow share their moods.
SD6. The celebrities I follow share their thoughts.
SD7. The celebrities I follow share their opinions.
SD8. The celebrities I follow share their beliefs.
Credibility

CRI. The social media opinion leader is a credible source of information for visually conspicuous products.

CR2. The social media opinion leader provides accurate and reliable information about visually conspicuous products.

CR3. I have confidence in the credibility of the social media opinion leader.

Brand Commitment

BC1. I am attached to the brand I use.

BC2. I stick with my usual brand because I know it is best for me.

BC3. I am committed to my brand.
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